



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,023	11/05/2007	Xiaoqin Duan	HW 0411199US	3927
74365	7590	07/02/2010	EXAMINER	
Slater & Matsil, L.L.P. 17950 Preston Road, Suite 1000 Dallas, TX 75252			BIBBEE, CHAYCE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@slater-matsil.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/563,023	DUAN, XIAOQIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAYCE BIBBEE	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thiebot (pub # 20040162054).

Consider claim 1. Thiebot teaches A method for handling event triggers and re-authorization triggers in flow based charging, comprising:

(A) TPF (traffic plane function) determining whether a bearer event matches an event trigger, if it matches, proceeding to step B, and otherwise, proceeding to step C; (**See at**

least paragraph [0030] and Fig. 3 where Thiebot discloses a "start of call event" message from the telephony network to the prepaid service SLP, thus a TPF determining whether a bearer event matches an event trigger).

(B) TPF requesting charging rules from CRF (charging rule function) and proceeding to step C; **(See at least paragraph [0032] where Thiebot discloses a charging PPS server sending specific parameters, thus charging rules).**

(C) TPF determining whether the bearer event matches a re-authorization trigger, if it matches, the TPF performing a re-authorization process. **(See at least paragraph [0035] where Thiebot discloses a re-authorization process).**

Consider claim 2. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein said step B comprises: TPF requesting a charging rule from CRF, and receiving the charging rule selected and returned by the CRF. **(See at least paragraph [0032]).**

Consider claim 3. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 2. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 2, wherein said step B further comprises TPF providing CRF with the bearer event. **(See at least paragraph [0030]).**

Consider claim 4. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 2. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 2, wherein, if TPF determines that the bearer event matches the event trigger, said step B further comprises said TPF

determining whether said charging rule provided by CRF is changed, if it is, the TPF performs a re-authorization process, and otherwise, proceeding to step C. (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).

Consider claim 5. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 4. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 4, in said step B, if the TPF determines the charging rule provided by CRF is changed, before the TPF performing a re-authorization process, further comprising: TPF determining whether a re-authorization is needed due to the changed charging rule, if it is, TPF performing a re-authorization process, and otherwise, proceeding to step C. (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).

Consider claim 6. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 4. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 4, in said step B, if the TPF determines a re-authorization is needed due to the changed charging rule, before the TPF performing a re-authorization process, further comprising: TPF determining whether the bearer event matches a re-authorization trigger, if it matches, TPF performing a re-authorization process, and providing OCS (online charging system) with the bearer event, and otherwise, TPF only performing the re-authorization process. (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).

Consider claim 7. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 4. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 4, wherein said performing a re-

authorization process further comprising: TPF providing OCS with the changed charging rule. **(See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 8. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein said performing a re-authorization process in step C further comprising: TPF providing OCS with the bearer event. **(See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 9. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein said performing a re-authorization process comprises: TPF requesting re-authorization of a credit in the OCS, and an authorized credit from the OCS. **(See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 10. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein said event triggers are provided to TPF by CRF. **(See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 11. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 1. Thiebot further teaches The method according to claim 1, wherein said re-authorization triggers are provided to TPF by OCS or via CRF by OCS. **(See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 12. Thiebot teaches A flow based charging rule (FBC) system, said system comprising:

a traffic plane function (TPF) entity communicatively connected to a charging rule function (CRF) entity and an online charging system (OCS), (**See at least paragraph [0030] and Fig. 3).**

wherein, when a bear modification occurs, the traffic plane function entity first determines, using event triggers, whether to request a charging rule from the charging rule function entity, and then determines, using re-authorization triggers, whether to perform a re authorization process with the online charging system. (**See at least paragraph [0035] where Thiebot discloses a re-authorization process).**

Consider claim 13. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Thiebot further teaches The system of claim 12, wherein, if the bear modification matches an event trigger, the TPF entity requests the charging rule from the CRF entity and provides the occurred bear modification to the CRF entity. (**See at least paragraph [0032]).**

Consider claim 14. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Thiebot further teaches The system of claim 12, wherein, if the occurred bear modification or the charging rule requested from the CRF entity matches a re-authorization trigger, the TPF

entity performs the re-authorization process. (**See at least paragraph [0035] where Thiebot discloses a re-authorization process).**

Consider claim 15. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 12. Thiebot further teaches The system of claim 14, wherein the TPF entity is further configured to provide the OCS with the occurred bear modification or the charging rule during the re-authorization process. (**See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 16. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 13. Thiebot further teaches The system of claim 13, wherein the TPF entity is further configured to determine whether the charging rule provided by the CRF entity is changed before determining whether to perform the re-authorization process, and, if the charging rule is changed or if the occurred bear modification matches a re-authorization trigger, perform the re-authorization process. (**See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 17. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 16. Thiebot further teaches The system of 16, wherein the TPF entity is further configured to provide the OCS with the charging rule or the occurred bear modification during performing the re- authorization process with the OCS. (**See at least paragraph [0035]).**

Consider claim 18. Thiebot teaches A method in a flow based charging system, said method comprising:

when a bear modification occurs, first determining, using event triggers, whether to request a charging rule from a charging rule function (CRF) entity in a flow based charging system, the determining performed by a traffic plane function (TPF) entity in the flow based charging system; (**See at least paragraph [0030] and Fig. 3**). and then determining, by the TPF entity using re-authorization triggers, whether to perform a re-authorization process with an online charging system (OCS) in the flow based charging system. (**See at least paragraph [0035] where Thiebot discloses a re-authorization process**).

Consider claim 19. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 18. Thiebot further teaches The method of claim 18, wherein the step of determining by the TPF entity whether to request the charging rule comprises:

requesting if the occurred bear modification matches an event trigger, requesting the charging rule from the CRF and providing the CRF entity with the occurred bear modification. (**See at least paragraph [0032]**).

Consider claim 20. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 19. Thiebot further teaches The method of claim 19, further comprising before determining whether to perform the re-authorization process:

deciding whether the charging rule provided by the CRF entity is changed, (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).and

wherein the step of determining, using re-authorization triggers, whether to perform a re-authorization request process comprises:

performing the re-authorization process with the OCS if the charging rule returned by the CRF entity is changed or if the occurred bear modification matches the re-authorization trigger. (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).

Consider claim 21. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 20. Thiebot further teaches The method of claim 20 further comprising: reporting, by the TPF entity, the charging rule or the bear modification to the OCS. (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).

Consider claim 22. Thiebot teaches all of the recited limitations of claim 18. Thiebot further teaches The method of claim 18, wherein the step of determining whether to perform a re-authorization request process comprises:

if the occurred bear modification matches the re-authorization trigger, requesting re-authorization of credit from the OCS and providing the occurred bear modification to the OCS. (**See at least paragraph [0035]**).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAYCE BIBBEE whose telephone number is (571)270-7222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

CHAYCE BIBBEE
Examiner
Art Unit 2617